

Roman Inscriptions from Aidepsos

Timothy E. Gregory

THE MODERN CITY of Loutra Aidepsou is located at the southeastern entrance to the Bay of Yaltra in the northern part of Euboea.¹ Hotels and restaurants line the waterfront, and a few find their way up the steep hill behind the town. In the winter the site is nearly deserted, but from Easter until autumn Loutra Aidepsou is a thriving and fashionable resort and health spa, attracting people from all over Greece who come to bathe in the copious thermal springs and enjoy the benefits of pleasant scenery and good company. A new road is presently being cut across the harsh western face of Euboea, from Chalkis to Aidepsos, but until that is completed the easiest means of access, today as it must have been in antiquity, is by frequent ferry from the mainland to the west. Alternatively, the visitor can take the older highway from Chalkis across the center of the island to Cape Artemision and Orei (ancient Histiaia), approaching Aidepsos across the spurs of Mt Telethrios from the north.

Most modern authorities place the ancient city at the site of the village of Lipso, some three kilometers north of Loutra Aidepsou, on a low hill at the head of a small plain where the narrow coastal band broadens into a fan.² Nevertheless, most of the extant archaeological evidence suggests that Aidepsos, at least in its most prosperous periods, was located at the site of the Baths. Thus, the earliest settlement, as was often the case, may well have been on the hill at Lipso, which is removed some distance from the sea. If so, the place must

¹ The modern literature on Aidepsos is far from extensive. It includes O. Hirschfeld, *RE* 1 (1894) 940–41; G. A. Papavasiliou, “Βαλανείον ‘Ρωμαϊκῶν χρόνων ἐν Αἰδηψῶ,” *ArchEph* 1907, 1–18; E. Ziebarth, “Aidepsos, ein griechischer Kurort,” *Hellas-Jahrbuch* 1936, 32–35; L. H. Sackett *et al.*, “Prehistoric Euboea: Contributions toward a Survey,” *BSA* 61 (1966) 39, esp. n.25; Thomas Jacobsen, in *Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites* (Princeton 1977) 19. *Cf.* the testimonia in *IG* XII.9 p.171. For a discussion of the physical and geographical setting of Aidepsos see Friedrich Teller, “Der geologische Bau der Insel Euboea,” *Denkschrift Wien*, Mathematisch-naturwissenschaftliche Kl. 40 (1880) 163–65.

² Hirschfeld, *loc.cit.* (*supra* n.1); Johannes Koder and Friedrich Hild, *Hellas und Thes-salia. Tabula Imperii Byzantini* I (Vienna 1976) 118.




Figure 1. SKETCH MAP OF NORTHERN EUBOIA

have been very small and singularly unimportant, since a thorough search of the area failed to reveal any pottery dating before the mediaeval period. Later, in the Hellenistic and particularly the Roman periods, the primary settlement was clearly on the coast at modern Loutra Aidepsou. Remains from the Roman age abound at the modern spa, including a large bathing complex excavated by Papavasiliou in 1905, several pieces of sculpture, and a number of similar brickwork structures, perhaps also baths, scattered throughout the town, as well as the inscriptions discussed below. In the troubled times of the Middle Ages people probably once again retreated to the relative safety of Lipso (taking with them a corruption of the earlier name), and this formed the primary settlement

until comparatively recently with the reëmergence of the health spa on the coast.³

In antiquity as today, the prime attraction of Aidepsos was its thermal springs, and it is clear that the site was a health spa as early as the fourth century B.C. (Arist. *Mete.* 2.366a; Phylarch. *FGrHist* 81 F 65) and perhaps earlier (Strabo 9.4.2, where the Baths are connected with Herakles). The most famous visitor was the conqueror Sulla, who went to Aidepsos in 86 B.C. to treat his gout; here he obtained a complete rest and enjoyed the company of the actors who were employed to entertain wealthy visitors (Plut. *Sull.* 2.6.3). In the early years of the first century after Christ, C. Poppaeus Sabinus, *legatus Augusti pro praetore* of the united province of Moesia, Macedonia and Achaia, received a delegation from the Thessalian *koinon* while he was in Aidepsos.⁴ Whether he was there on an official tour or for personal relaxation we cannot be certain.

During the second century of our era Aidepsos apparently reached the peak of its prosperity and elegance as one of the main social centers for the affluent Greek provincial aristocracy.⁵ Plutarch was from nearby Chaironeia, and he obviously knew the site well. Thus, he provides a first-hand glimpse into the splendor of society and its accoutrements at Aidepsos (*Mor.* 667c): "Aidepsos in Euboia has become a popular resort for people from all over Greece; its hot springs are a place equipped by nature with many resources for the enjoyment of leisure and embellished by houses and apartments."

³ For the phenomenon of the 'transfer' of the Mediterranean city, see E. Kirsten, "Die byzantinische Stadt," *Diskussionsbeiträge zum XI. Internat. Byzantinistenkongress München 1958* (Munich 1961) 75–102.

⁴ *IG IX.2* 261. On Poppaeus Sabinus see Edmund Groag, *Die römischen Reichsbeamten von Achaia bis auf Diokletian* (Schr. Balkankommission, Antiquarische Abt.9, Vienna 1939) 23–24. See also J. A. O. Larsen, "Roman Greece," in Tenney Frank, ed., *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome IV* (Baltimore 1938) 442; Antony E. Raubitschek, "Two Notes on the *Fasti* of Achaia," in George E. Mylonas and Doris Raymond, eds., *Studies Presented to David Moore Robinson II* (St Louis 1953) 330–33; and Victor Ehrenberg, "Legatus Augusti et Tiberii?," *ibid.* 938–44. According to Tacitus (*Ann.* 5.10) Poppaeus Sabinus sailed past Euboia in A.D. 31 on his way to Actium to investigate the appearance of someone posing as Drusus Caesar, the son of Germanicus. The haste with which this journey must have been undertaken, however, makes it likely that the governor visited Aidepsos on a different occasion.

⁵ On the importance of places such as Aidepsos for the aristocracy of Roman Greece, see the thoughtful comments of C. P. Jones, "A Leading Family of Roman Thespiai," *HSCP* 74 (1970) 223: "In the way of such classes, these prominent and educated Greeks allied their families in marriage and had their favourite meeting places, a comfortable watering spot or a famous city at the time of festival."

Indeed, by Plutarch's time Aidepsos had become a symbol of ostentatious luxury, a place where game, fowl and fish were available in abundance and where the wealthy "gather together, exempt from every want, and, having the leisure, engage endlessly in conversation." The swimming baths (κολυμβήθραι) and banquet halls (ἀνδρῶνες) were particular objects of admiration, and envious individuals in other cities attempted to imitate Aidepsos' lustre—in the process they rerouted aqueducts and disrupted official services, thus earning, incidentally, the wrath of the emperor (Plut. *Mor.* 487F).

Much of the wealth of Aidepsos, then as now, was imported, and the city must have had something of a carnival atmosphere, but as an important provincial center it certainly deserves further investigation and study. In the nineteenth and early twentieth century the known inscriptions and the meagre archaeological evidence were gathered together and subjected to preliminary analysis. In the past fifty years, however, there has been little interest in the site even though some new evidence has appeared. This general scholarly indifference toward Aidepsos is probably the result of its relative unimportance in the classical period: at its height Aidepsos was entirely a product of the imperial age.

In the classical period Aidepsos formed part of the territory of Histiaia, whose civic center lay some fifteen kilometers away to the north across the spurs of Mt Telethrios. A passage in Strabo (10.1.3; *cf.* 1.3.20, 9.4.2, 10.1.5) that lists Aidepsos as one of the earliest communities conquered by Ellopos suggests that this arrangement was of considerable antiquity. Such a situation is at first sight surprising, since Aidepsos and Histiaia are separated by reasonably formidable terrain and each faces in a different direction on the sea: Histiaia (the modern Orei) looks northward toward Thessaly and the Sporades, while Aidepsos faces south toward Phokis and Boiotia. Historically, however, Euboia has produced few cities, and diverse areas have frequently been joined together politically. Undoubtedly this was the result of the rugged terrain of the island and the relatively low population that gave Euboia the reputation as the very epitome of rustic life.⁶ Thus, although covering a huge land mass, Euboia is 'naturally' divided into only four distinct political units:

⁶ Thus, Dio Chrys. *Or.* 7; Plut. *De def.or.* 413F–14A. *Cf.* Larsen, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.4) 481–82.

one in the north, focusing on Histiaia, two in the west center where the land is better, with centers at Chalkis and Eretria, and one in the south around Karystos.⁷ Historically this has been the political arrangement, and all smaller communities have been joined to one of the larger centers.

For much of its history, then, Aidepsos was merely part of the city territory of Histiaia; as we have seen, however, under Roman domination the site came into its own at least as a place of refreshment and entertainment. The inscriptions from Aidepsos shed much light on this period of the history of the site. In addition, these inscriptions provide further insights into Greek provincial society under Roman rule and the transformations of urban life which took place toward the end of antiquity. I personally examined all of the extant inscriptions (*i.e.* other than **4-7** and **11**), at Aidepsos and Chalkis, during the summer of 1978, and the following analysis is a result of that study. I have not indicated where earlier readings can no longer be confirmed.

I. To the Time of Hadrian

1. Marble statue base, height 1.17 m., width 0.78 m., thickness 0.65 m., discovered during construction work in Loutra Aidepsou in 1965, presumably *in situ*, along with **8** and a relief depicting a lion and a snake. Presently outside the *apotheke* of the Archaeological Service in Loutra Aidepsou. *Deltion* 20 (1965), *Chronika* 256; S. N. Koumanoudis, *Deltion* 21 (1966) 142-43, with photograph.

Τι. Κλαύδιον Ἀσιατικὸν
 Τι. Κλαύδιος Ἀσιατικὸς
 ὁ πατήρ
 καὶ Κλαυδία Ἰταλική
 τὸν ἔκγονον
 δόγματι βουλῆς
 καὶ δήμου.

⁷ Thus, Fritz Geyer, *Topographie und Geschichte der Insel Euböia im Altertum* (Berlin 1902), divided his discussion of the island into three geographical units, although he included such cities as Kyme and Kerinthos. See also William Wallace, "The Demes of Eretria," *Hesperia* 16 (1947) 115, 146 n.99, "there were in fact only four cities in Euböia"; Alfred Philippson, *Die griechischen Landschaften I.2, Das östliche Mittelgriechenland und die Insel Euböia* (Frankfort 1951) 569-82; Ernst Kirsten, *ibid.* 673; Johannes Koder, *Negroponte* (Vienna 1973) 109ff.

2. Marble statue base, height 0.64 m., width 0.92 m., thickness 0.705 m., previously built into a wall, now outside the so-called Cave of Sulla in Loutra Aidepsou. G. A. Papavasiliou, *ArchEph* 1907, 11–12, no.1; A. Wilhelm, *Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde* (Vienna 1909) [*hereafter*, WILHELM, *Beiträge*] no.113 with photograph; Ziebarth, *IG XII.9* 1234A.

Ἀὐτοκράτορα Τραϊανὸν Ἀδρι-
ανὸν Καίσαρα Σεβαστὸν Ὀλύμ-
πιον σωτήρα καὶ κτίστην ἢ βου-
λὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος Ἰστιαίων ἐπι-
μεληθέντος Λ. Νοοῦίου Ὀπτάτου.

Koumanoudis, the editor of the first inscription, dated it on the basis of letter forms to the middle of the first century after Christ. T. Claudius Asiaticus and his like-named son are otherwise unknown, but a similar inscription from Chalkis (*IG XII.9* 1145) mentions a Claudia Italike: *Τιβ. Κλαύδιος Δημόνικος καὶ Κλαυδία Ἰταλική Τιβ. Κλαύδιον Δημόνικον τὸν ἑαυτῶν υἱόν*. Koumanoudis argued against the identification of the two women because they had different husbands: T. Claudius Asiaticus in **1** and T. Claudius Demonikos in *IG XII.9* 1145. This is predicated, however, on the understanding of ἔκγονος as ‘son’, while the more common meaning is ‘grandson’ or ‘descendant’. Thus, it is possible that the two women are one and the same and that, perhaps after the death of his wife, T. Claudius Asiaticus I honored his son along with the youth’s grandmother: such a reading is preferable for the new Aidepsos inscription. If this was the case, then the woman was a Claudia who married a Claudius, exactly the situation we see in *IG XII.9* 1145. Thus, Claudia Italike was either the mother or the mother-in-law of T. Claudius Asiaticus I, and he and T. Claudius Demonikos II were either brothers or brothers-in-law.

Claudia Italike may have been of Italian descent, perhaps a member of one of the families of Italian *negotiatores* who came to Greece in the wake of the Roman conquest.⁸ But names such as Italicus and Asiaticus are otherwise attested in Asia Minor and Egypt, and some may represent Latinizing appellations given to Imperial freedmen in the first century.⁹ Certainly such names would

⁸ Jean Hatzfeld, *Les trafiquants italiens dans l'orient hellénique* (Paris 1919).

⁹ Thus, a Lucius Antistius Asiaticus, ἑπαρχος ὄρουσ Βερενείκης, in an inscription from

not have been borne by members of the traditional Greek aristocracy, who would have maintained their family name as a cognomen. In any case Claudia Italike was obviously fully integrated into local Greek society and wealthy enough to erect a statue of her grandson.

The new inscription from Aidepsos further confirms an important connection between that center and Chalkis: even if we reject the identity of the two *Claudiae*, the inscriptions clearly refer to the same family, which obviously had interests in both cities. We have seen that Aidepsos attracted more than imperial officials on vacation. Euboea, of course, lay at the eastern end of an important trading road that brought it into close connection with Italy and the West: merchants from Italy sailed up the Gulf of Corinth to Kreusai, the port of Thespiiai, and from there across land to the ports of Boiotia and Euboea. Chalkis, which was the home of many Italian *negotiatores*, played an important rôle in this east-west trade, and it is reasonable to assume that Aidepsos was involved as well.¹⁰ This may explain why a family of businessmen or imperial freedmen found their way to the city, although they may simply have come there in imitation of the aristocracy they had joined.

Probably because it was a place where the provincial aristocracy congregated, the Roman emperors took an interest in Aidepsos at least from the beginning of the second century. As a result there must have been periodic imperial donations, and a number of dedications to honor the emperors have survived. The first of these, our **2**, is a dedication to Hadrian which, as Wilhelm noted, must be dated to the years after A.D. 128 when Hadrian took the title *Olympius*.¹¹ This inscription, however, was probably not a simple response to imperial beneficence but a reflection of Hadrian's Panhellenic campaign directed toward the Greek cities. Similar inscriptions, on altars and

Koptos (*OGIS* 674.7); Valerius Asiaticus, proconsul of Asia at the time of Trajan (*OGIS* 481.7, *cf.* p.90 n.5); and Italici from Egypt (Friedrich Preisigke, *Namenbuch* [Heidelberg 1922] 154). The most famous Asiaticus, of course, was the freedman of Vitellius (Tac. *Hist.* 2.47; Suet. *Vitell.* 12; *PIR*², A1216). *Cf.* P. R. C. Weaver, *Familia Caesaris* (Cambridge 1972) 24–92, esp. 80–86.

¹⁰ Hatzfeld, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.8) 39–41, 67–73; Jones, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 242. The question of trans-Boiotian trade has been much-debated for the prehistoric period. See A. W. Gomme, "The Topography of Boeotia and the Theories of M. Bérard," *BSA* 18 (1911/12) 189–210.

¹¹ P. von Rohden, *RE* 1 (1894) 500 and 509; J. Beaujeu, *La religion romaine à l'apogée de l'empire* (Paris 1955) 200–02.

statue bases, have been discovered at Athens and throughout the Greek world—all dating to the late 120's or early 130's—and they are to be viewed as part of the larger phenomenon that led to the construction on the Panhellenion and the Olympieion in Athens.¹² The inscription at Aidepsos has not, so far as I am aware, been cited in any of the studies of the Panhellenic policies of Hadrian, but it does not unfortunately contribute any specific new knowledge about that program, except to document the participation of loyal subjects in northern Euboeia. The formula Ὀλύμπιος σωτήρ καὶ κτίστης is common, particularly in the many Hadrianic dedications at Athens, and we cannot assume from this evidence alone that the emperor was particularly interested in Histiaia or that he was a 'founder' there in any special sense. Probably the statue was erected in A.D. 131/2 when the Olympieion was dedicated in Athens.

L. Novius Optatus is otherwise unknown. The *nomen* Novius, however, is fairly common: a certain L. Novius Rufus of Apollonia in Cyrenaica made a similar dedication to Hadrian at Athens (*IG II*² 3306) and L. Novius Lysanias is mentioned at Chalkis (*IG XII.9* 906; *Syll.*³ 898). All three may have been members of a single family, perhaps descended from Italian *negotiatores*, which was particularly prominent in Roman Achaia.¹³ In any case, Novius Optatus, with no Greek element in his name, was certainly an important man since he undertook to pay for the statue of the emperor. It is possible that he was himself an Italian specially deputed to oversee the honoring of Hadrian, but it is more likely that he was a resident of Histiaia.¹⁴

Although the statue of Hadrian and that of Claudius Asiaticus were voted by "the city of Histiaia," they were certainly erected at Aidepsos. The Hadrianic base is large, and it is unlikely to have travelled far from its location outside the so-called Cave of Sulla at Loutra Aidepsou: in the summer of 1978 three individuals tried to move the stone slightly to photograph the reverse side, but they were unable even to budge it. The inscription shows that Aidepsos

¹² Paul Graindor, *Athènes sous Hadrien* (Cairo 1934) 50–51, 66–68; Anna S. Benjamin, "The Altars of Hadrian in Athens and Hadrian's Panhellenism Program," *Hesperia* 32 (1963) 57–86.

¹³ See Groag, *RE* 17 (1936) 1214–21; as Groag points out, there is no reason to connect these men with the various prominent L. Novii of the late first and second centuries.

¹⁴ Graindor, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.12) 68–71, discusses the importance of the individuals selected to supervise such dedications. For the sense of ἐπιμεληθέντος, see James H. Oliver, "Imperial Commissioners in Achaia," *GRBS* 14 (1973) 399.

remained under the jurisdiction of Histiaia through the time of Hadrian and that the city chose the popular resort as the site for such an important imperial dedication.

II. From Septimius Severus to Gordian III

3. Marble statue base, height 1.192 m., width 0.632 m., thickness 0.595 m., formerly built into the same wall as **2**, now in front of the so-called Cave of Sulla at Loutra Aidepsou. Papavasiliou, *ArchEph* 1907, 12–13, no.3; Wilhelm, *Beiträge*, no.115 and p.310 (photograph of squeeze); *IG XII.9 1235A*.

<p> <i>Αὐτοκράτορα Καί- αρα Ἀ. Σεπτίμιον Σευῆρον Περτίνα- 4 κα Σεβ. Ἀραβικὸν Ἀδι- αβηνικὸν μέγιστον Ἐστιεῶν ἡ πόλις</i> </p>	<p> <i>ἐκ τῶν αὐτῆς πόρων 8 ἐπιμελουμένου Θεονίκου τοῦ Νίκω- νος ἐπὶ λογιστοῦ Κλ. Σατύρου.</i> </p>
---	---

The upper right-hand corner of the stone has been damaged, and chips have been taken out at various places.

4 and **5.** Statue base of soft stone, height 1.72 m., width 0.62 m., thickness 0.49 m. Formerly in the courtyard of a private house in Loutra Aidepsou; now lost. Copy of E. J. Doyle.

- 4.**
- Αὐτοκράτορα Καίσαρα Σεπτί-
 μιον Σεουῆρον Περτίνακα
 Σεβ(αστόν) Εὐσεβ(ῆ) Ἀραβικὸν {Ἀδι}*
- 4** *Ἀδιαβηνικὸν μέγιστον Ἐ-
 στιεῶν ἡ πόλις ἐκ τῶν αὐ-
 τῆς πόρων ἀνέστησεν
 ἐπιμελησαμένου Κλ. Ἐνελ-
 8 πίστου νε(ωτέρου).*
- 5.**
- Αὐτοκράτορα Καίσαρα Μάρκον
 Αὐρήλιον Ἀντωνεῖνον Εὐσεβῆ{ν}
 Σεβαστόν.*

6 and **7.** Marble plaque, height 0.55 m., width 1.52 m., thickness 0.16 m., previously built into the church of St Constantine in the town of the same name at ancient Daphnous opposite Eubodia. The

church has been destroyed and the present location of the stone is unknown. Dittenberger, *IG IX* 288–89; Wilhelm, *Beiträge*, no.118; *IG XII.9* 1237.

6. *Αὐτοκράτορα Καίσαρα Μ. Αὐρήλιον Ἀντωνεῖνον καὶ* [[*Αὐτοκράτορα Καίσαρα Π. Σεπτίμιον Γέταν*]]

ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος.

7. *Μ. Ἀντώνιον Γορδιανὸν Ἐστιαίων ἡ πόλις.*

8. Inscription on the reverse of the Hadrianic statue base (2). Most of the words have been erased by the Constantinian inscription *infra* (10). Papavasiliou, *ArchEph* 1907, 12, no.2; Wilhelm, *Beiträge*, no.114; *IG XII.9* 1234B.

Ἐστιαίων ἡ πόλις.

Ἐστιαίων Wilhelm and Ziebarth.

9. Marble statue base, height 1.325 m., width 0.60 m., thickness 0.525 m., found in 1965 at Loutra Aidepsou, presumably *in situ*, along with 1. Now outside the *apotheke* of the Archaeological Service at Loutra Aidepsou. *Deltion* 20 (1965), *Chronika* 256; S. N. Koumanoudis, *Deltion* 21 (1966) 143–44, with photograph.

Ψ Β Κ Δ

*Ἡ κρατίστη Φλ. Φιλείνα,
θυγάτηρ τῶν λαμπροτάτων
ὑπατικῶν Φλαβίων Φιλείνου
καὶ Ἀμφικλείας, Μάρκον
Αὐρήλιον Ὀλυμπιόδωρον,
ἕκγονον Ἰπποδρόμου, τὸν
πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν ἄριστον, τὸν
γλυκύτετον καὶ σεμνότατον
ἄνδρα, κατὰ τὸ τῆς ἱερωτάτης
βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ σεμνοτάτου
δήμου ψήφισμα τῆς Ἐστι-
εῶν πόλεως.*

The dedication of the statue of Septimius Severus (3) is to be dated between A.D. 195, when he took the titles Arabicus and Adiabenicus, and 198, when he was acclaimed as Parthicus Maximus.¹⁵ No specific motive can be identified for the dedication.

¹⁵ Anthony Birley, *Septimius Severus, The African Emperor* (Garden City [N.J.] 1971) 182,

Presumably Severus had made some benefaction to Histiaia and the statue was set up in response. Once again, the statue base is very large and it must have been erected not far from its present location in Loutra Aidepsou.

We cannot unfortunately identify the two officials named in the inscription. Theonikos and Nikon are extremely common names, and both father and son were undoubtedly wealthy residents of Histiaia. Claudius Satyros was an imperial *curator*, appointed by the emperor to supervise the finances of the city. (Indeed, might the rectification of the city's finances, perhaps with imperial assistance, have been the reason for the dedication of the statue?) His name shows that he was a Romanized Greek, but it is impossible to say anything about his specific place of origin. The nomination of an imperial *curator* is both indicative of the high standing of Histiaia in the province (only free cities were given *curatores*) and suggestive that the city had undergone some financial difficulties in the previous years.¹⁶ One should also note that the citizens of the city are called 'Εστιαεῖς rather than 'Ιστιαεῖς, although both designations are otherwise attested.¹⁷

4 and **5** have not been previously published. The stone was found by E. J. Doyle in 1951 at the same place where he discovered a fragment of Diocletian's Edict on Maximum Prices (*infra*). With the assistance of the Archaeological Service I made a search for this stone in Loutra Aidepsou during the summer of 1978, but I was unable to locate it. We may hope that it will turn up once again, but in the meantime I have used Doyle's notes as the basis of the texts. Unfortunately Doyle's notes do not indicate the placement of the two inscriptions on the stone, nor whether they are complete (*e.g.*, could **5** have had a dedicatory formula?).

202. Septimius Severus was busy during these years first with the war against Clodius Albinus and then with the Parthians, and he cannot have visited the Aegean personally. One is tempted to connect this dedication (and the others discussed *infra*) with the issue of imperial loyalty that was particularly pressing at this time. Pescennius Niger had won considerable support in the East, and Septimius' hatred of those cities which had sided with his enemy was famous (witness the fate of Byzantium). Perhaps Histiaia had supported Niger or, more likely, perhaps a donation of Septimius to Histiaia (which resulted in the dedication) was part of a policy to secure the loyalty of the eastern cities.

¹⁶ On the λογιστής see M. N. Tod, "Notes and Inscriptions from S.-W. Messenia," *JHS* 25 (1905) 44, who does not cite Histiaia as a city which had received a *curator* (other cities were Athens, Chaironea, Epidauros, Sparta and Troezen).

¹⁷ F. Geyer, *RE* Suppl. 4 (1924) 749–57, especially 749, where he suggests that 'Εστίαια represented Euboian usage while 'Ιστίαια was Attic. Stephanos of Byzantium has entries under 'Εστίαια and 'Ιστίαια and he comments on different usages in Euboia and elsewhere.

The dedication to Septimius Severus (4) is nearly a duplicate of 3. Its chief interest is to show that Histiaia made at least two dedications to Septimius Severus within a relatively short period. Also of interest is the apparent incompetence of the mason, who made two errors in the third line. Claudius Enelpistos is otherwise unknown; he and his father of the same name should be added to the growing list of Claudii attested at Aidepsos.

The dedication to Caracalla (5) suggests that the stone supported statues of the two emperors, father and son; its size, however, would argue against this. The omission of Geta from the dedication allows two chronological reconstructions. First, the two inscriptions may have been cut between A.D. 198 when Caracalla was made Augustus and 209 when Geta attained this rank.¹⁸ Alternatively, the first inscription (4) may have been set up during the lifetime of Septimius and the second cut later, under Caracalla, after the murder of his brother in A.D. 212.

Dittenberger saw that the stone found at Daphnous opposite Euboia (6-7) probably came from Aidepsos. Its size and shape suggest that it was not a statue base like most of the other stones here but an architrave or facing block, probably from a temple or other public building. It preserves traces of two inscriptions, the second cut nearly directly over the first. The earlier of these two dedications was originally to Caracalla and Geta without any apparent indication of the city. This must have been set up either during the life of their father or shortly after their joint accession in A.D. 211. Some time after Geta's murder in 212, however, his name was carefully removed from the stone. The inscription is further evidence of rather considerable activity at Aidepsos during the Severan period.

After the passage of some time and a probable disuse or rebuilding of the monument in which the stone was set, 7 was inscribed on the same stone. This inscription was in honor of Gordian III, the unfortunate emperor who ascended the throne in A.D. 238 at the age of thirteen and was assassinated by the troops of Philip the Arab some six years later.¹⁹ There is no apparent reason why Gordian

¹⁸ Doyle's notes do not, unfortunately, indicate any difference in the lettering or style which would help to determine whether the inscriptions could have been contemporary. On the use of *Εὐσεβής* see J. H. Oliver, "The Piety of Commodus and Caracalla," *GRBS* 19 (1978) 375-88, esp. 380.

¹⁹ *SHA Vita Gordiani*; cf. K. F. W. Lehmann, *Kaiser Gordian III* (Berlin 1911).

should have been commemorated at Aidepsos, and it is clearly impossible that he ever visited the city personally during his short reign. The young emperor was, however, personally popular, and the honorific inscription may have been connected with the administrative reforms carried out before he set out for war in the East; the nomenclature on the inscription is the same as that on his coins struck through A.D. 240.²⁰ Although surviving imperial dedications from the mid-third century are rare in Greece, there are two other inscriptions of Gordian from Kainepolis in Lakonia (*IG V* 1241–42), suggesting a hitherto unsuspected interest of the emperor in the province of Achaia. In an interesting article Louis Robert suggested that Gordian III connected his military policy with the support of the Greek goddess Athena and the revival of the struggle between East and West begun at the time of the great Persian Wars in the fifth century.²¹ Perhaps the Aidepsos inscription should be seen against the background of that policy.

8 preserves only the last line of what was probably a five-line imperial dedication, cut on the reverse of the Hadrianic statue base (**2**). Since the inscription is so fragmentary, it is impossible to provide a firm date for this dedication, although the squared lunate *sigmas* and the cursive *omega* indicate a date clearly after the Hadrianic inscription, probably during the third century. In the troubles of the third century the Hadrianic statue may have fallen, making the base available for reuse. The top of the statue base preserves cuttings that show where a statue was set up in the new direction.

Flavia Philina's dedication of a statue of her husband M. Aurelius Olympiodoros (**9**) was discovered at Aidepsos along with **1** and some architectural fragments "within the enclosure of a sanctuary." This inscription has already been the subject of considerable scholarly interest because of the light it sheds on one of the great families of central Greece in the Roman period.²² The date of the dedication has been debated, the issue once again turning on the exact sense of *ἔκγονος*: 'son' (Koumanoudis and Müller) or 'grandson, descendant' (Jones)? On the basis of the discussion on the *Claudiae Italicae*

²⁰ The *Vita Gordiani* (34.3) says that he got as far south as Philippi in Macedonia, but this seems unlikely. On the emperor's popularity see *Vita Gord.* 30.8, 31.4–7, and Kenan T. Erim and Joyce Reynolds, "A Letter of Gordian III from Aphrodisias in Caria," *JRS* 59 (1969) 56–58.

²¹ "Deux concours grecs à Rome," *CRAI* 1970, 11–17.

²² H. Müller, "Marcus Aurelius Olympiodorus, *ἔκγονος* 'Ἰπποδρόμου,'" *ΖΡΕ* 3 (1968) 197–220; and Jones, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 238–39, 255.

above, the latter view seems preferable; in any case, the present inscription is to be dated to the first half of the third century—it may well be contemporary with 7.

What has not been noticed about the dedication to Olympiodoros is the information it conveys about Aidepsos. In the first place, as with the inscription honoring Gordian III, it shows that Aidepsos continued to belong to Histiaia through the middle of the third century and that the city continued to erect important monuments there. Aidepsos still flourished as an aristocratic resort into the third century and remained a crossroads and social center of the province. We do not know what Flavia Philina and M. Aurelius Olympiodoros were doing in Aidepsos, but the official nature of the decree requires that they have had some substantial interest in the area. Flavia Philina's family was from Thespias in Boiotia, a city which had close connections with Chalkis. Olympiodoros' family was probably from Larissa in Thessaly, although it had attained considerable Panhellenic importance during the life of the sophist Hippodromos.²³ It is entirely in keeping with the life of Aidepsos as a crossroads of provincial aristocratic society that a woman from Boiotia should have dedicated a statue to her Thessalian husband there. One cannot be certain, but it is likely that Olympiodoros had provided some benefaction or service to Histiaia, and that the enabling decree for the erection of the statue was a reward for this.

III. From Diocletian to Theodosius and Beyond

10. Inscription on the reverse of the Hadrianic statue base (2); cf. 8. Papavasiliou, *ArchEph* 1907, 12, no.2; Wilhelm, *Beiträge*, no.114; *IG XII.9 1234B*.

Τὸν ἐπιφανέστατον
 Αὔγουστον Φλ. Κωνσταντεῖνον
 ἢ πόλις Αἰδηψηγνῶν
 [ἐκ τῶν αὐτῆς] πόρω[ν].

2: I confirm Wilhelm's Φλ., which Papavasiliou and Ziebarth could not see.

11. A "small stone" from Aidepsos that apparently disappeared shortly after its first publication. *Ἐφημερίς τῶν Φιλομαθῶν*, 20 August 1866, 1023 [Wilhelm, *Beiträge*, no.117; *IG XII.9 1236*].

²³ Jones, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 238–39.

Τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν τὸν
 Αὐτοκράτορα Αὐγου-
 στον Φλα. Θεοδόσιον
 ἢ πόλις Αἰδηψη<ν>ῶν.

4: H the original publication, evidently a misprint.

12. Two fragments of a stele at Aidepsos, height 0.60 m., width 0.26 m., thickness 0.05 m. In 1978 I was able to locate only a piece of the upper fragment, lines 1–3 to the right (height 0.121 m., width 0.135 m., thickness 0.032 m.); in the Museum at Chalkis, no.239. Papavasiliou, *ArchEph* 1907, 18, no.8; *IG XII.9* 1239.

	Ἐκ δισσω̄ν γονέων	της [-----
	ἀρετὴν βίου ἔσχον	μινα[-----
	ὁμοίαν εὐξάμε-	12 θελιεο[-----
4	νοί τε θεῶ̄ ἔσχον	κεῖμαι π[-----
	με μόνον ἀγαπη-	-----
	τὸν μητ[ρῶ]αν	---- χρ]ησ[τι]-
	τε γ[-----	16 ανὸς μνη[-----
8	πατρὸ[ε-----	πεντήκοντα
	-----	τῆς λεγεῶνος.

13. Marble stele, height 0.95 m., width 0.35–0.43 m., thickness 0.8 m., back roughly picked, sides cut probably for reuse. Surface of the stone starting to peel away; some of the readings given in *IG* now uncertain. At the bottom a ship sailing right, with mast and triangular sail and double steering oars. Previously built into the church of St John at Koubi (Aidepsos), now in the museum at Chalkis (no.238). Papavasiliou, *ArchEph* 1907, 15–18, no.7; *IG XII.9* 1240. Cf. L. Robert, *BCH* 102 (1978) 423 fig.5 (discussion and photograph).

	Ἐνθάδ' ἐγὼ	12	μοῖς λουτρώσασ-
	κεῖμαι Διογενι-		θαι Αἰδέψου. Ἡ δὲ
	ανὸς Νεικομη-		πικρὰ μοῖρα οὕτω
4	δεύς, πολλῶν		ἐμιτώσατο, θερμί-
	φίλος πρότερον,	16	ζειν με δι' ὁδοῦ. Καὶ
	νῦν δὲ κατήλθον		διὰ ταύτης μου τῆς
	εἰς Αἶδαο, πολλὰ πε-		στήλλης μηνύω τοῖς
8	ριπλεύσας πρότε-		παροδείταις ζῶν
	ρον ναυκληρῶν,	20	κτῶ χρῶ· τὸ γὰρ θα-
	εἶτα τὸ νῦν κυβερ-		νεῖν πᾶσι κέκραται.
	ρῶν παρήμην θερ-		

14. Marble plaque, height 0.36 m., width 0.33 m., thickness 0.09 m., broken at the bottom. Previously built into the church of St Constantine near Lipso, now in the museum at Chalkis (no.237). *IG XII.9* 1241; Peek, *Gr.Vers-Inscr.* 579.

Ἐνθάδε Σώτηρον
 Χαιρωνέα χαλκεο-
 τέχνην Αἰδηψοῦ δά-
 4 [πε]δον τὸν φίλιον κα-
 [τέ]χει· ἀντ' ἰδίας πατρί-
 [δος] γὰρ ἐπέινεσεν ἐνθά-
 [δε ναί]ειν ταῖς ἰλαραῖς αἰ-
 8 [εἰ τῆ]δε πέλα]ς Ναιΐειν.

Before examining these later inscriptions we should mention one other text that has not been included in the present survey—a fragment of Diocletian's Edict on Maximum Prices that E. J. Doyle discovered at Aidepsos along with **4** and **5**. This has recently been published along with Doyle's commentary, and it is unnecessary to repeat what was said there.²⁴ It is noteworthy, however, that this new inscription provides information about the prices of common metals such as copper and bronze which were otherwise missing from existing copies of the Edict. Furthermore, Doyle associated the Aidepsos fragment with Histiaia and reasonably noted that "Each major city appears to have had its copy of the Edict, and of the four important cities of Euboia (Karystos, Eretria, Chalkis and Histiaia) only Chalkis has thus far not produced any fragments" (p.79). We shall return to both of Doyle's observations in examining the inscriptions that follow.

10 is obviously to be assigned to the Constantinian dynasty, but the laconic text does not allow us to be certain whether the statue was of Constantine the father or the son. The epithet ἐπιφανέστατος, *nobilissimus*, was the normal designation of a Caesar, thus suggesting that Αὔγουστον was cut over an original Καίσαρα or Σεβαστόν, although the poor condition of the stone precludes certainty on this. A dedication to Constans I from Delphi (*Syll.*³ 903D) provides a remarkably close parallel: Τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν ἐπιφανέστατον Αὔγουστον Φλάβ. Κώσταν ἡ ἱερὰ Δελφῶν πόλις. Here the title *Augustus* was a later addition, and

²⁴ E. J. Doyle, "Two New Fragments of the Edict of Diocletian on Maximum Prices," *Hesperia* 45 (1976) 77-97, edited by S. Laufer.

Claude Vatin has rightly pointed to the significance of the change as evidence for an understanding of the powers of the sons of Constantine after 337.²⁵ Specifically, he argued that the inscription from Delphi showed that Constans controlled Illyricum after his father's death. Vatin's points are well taken, but the identification of the Constantine of the Aidepsos inscription as Constantine II appears to contradict his argument about the division of the Empire, since there can be no question that the younger Constantine held effective control of Greece. Perhaps the dedication originally formed part of a group honoring Constantine and his three sons sometime before 337. Alternatively, the inscription may be assigned to Constantine the Great and dated to the period of civil war after the abdication of Diocletian when Constantine was temporarily recognized as Caesar (although there are, to my knowledge, no other inscriptions of Constantine as Caesar that were later changed to Augustus). More probably the honorand was Constantine II, and we must admit that such a dedication had no territorial significance.

Most importantly, however, **10** shows that Aidepsos had finally attained civic status: the dedication was made not by Histiaia, as in all the preceding inscriptions (including the other two cut on the same stone), but by Aidepsos itself with the designation *πόλις*. There is no literary evidence to date this administrative and legal change, but we can assign it on the basis of the inscriptions to the period between the reign of Gordian III and the early fourth century. This was the period of the fiscal and administrative reforms of Diocletian and Constantine, and we should probably associate the elevation of Aidepsos with those measures. It is possible, even, that the dedication to Constantine was in response to the 'founding' of the city, although the inscription makes no mention of this.

The lost statue base of the emperor Theodosius (**11**) is one of the very few inscriptions from the Theodosian house in Greece, and it is particularly unfortunate that we cannot be certain whether Aidepsos honored Theodosius the Great (379–395) or his grandson Theodosius II (408–450). The text shows, however, that the civic status reflected in **10** was not temporary: Aidepsos continued to enjoy its independence and corporate existence at least until the end of the fourth century and probably beyond.

²⁵ "Les empereurs du IV^e siècle à Delphes," *BCH* 86 (1962) 233–34. Among the few other Constantinian inscriptions from the province of Achaia are the following: *BCH* 90 (1966) 243 (Aigosthena) and 246–47 (Lebadeia) [*SEG* XXIII 266 and 296].

The remaining three inscriptions (**12–14**) are all funerary, and none can be closely dated; on the basis of letter-style and general content, however, all would seem to fall in the period between the third and the sixth century. **12** is a particularly tantalizing text, and it was disappointing to find only a fragment surviving. (According to Papavasiliou, however, the lower half had been severely damaged by continuous use as a household sink.) The funerary epigram may be that of a Christian (lines 15–16), although other reconstructions are at least as likely at that point; the prayer to θεῶν, however, does at least suggest monotheism. Especially difficult is the last line, which seems to mention a “legion”: exactly what πεντήκοντα τῆς λεγεῶνος means is uncertain,²⁶ but in any case one should probably hesitate to make too much of such evidence in a poetic text.

13 and **14** provide further evidence of Aidepsos’ ability to attract people from other areas, but in this case not only members of the wealthy provincial aristocracy but ordinary persons as well. Diogenianos in **13** was from Nikomedia, the famous metropolis in Bithynia. His complaint on the paradox of death is commonplace, but his (or more likely his heir’s) comment on the peculiarity of being buried at a famous spa is particularly humorous:²⁷ “Here I lie, Diogenianos of Nikomedia. Before I had many friends, but now I have gone down to Hades; before I sailed as captain to many places, but now as navigator I remain to bathe at the hot baths of Aidepsos. Thus bitter fate spun it out, for me to bathe by the road. And through this my stele I remind passers-by: ‘Acquire and make use of things while you are still alive’. For death is the fate of all.” Diogenianos was a sailor and he undoubtedly died at Aidepsos while on a journey, although as a ναυκληρῶν he must have had means enough to secure a proper epitaph. Especially interesting is the representation of a ship carved at the bottom of his tombstone.

Soteros in **14** was a bronzeworker, and he left his native Chaironea,

²⁶ Perhaps one might suggest an otherwise unattested *pentekontarches*, in analogy to *pentarches*, *hekatontarches*, etc., although it is hardly reasonable to suppose that there are military ranks of which we are unaware. On the other hand, the *πεντήκοντα* may be connected with the possible mention of ‘month’ (*μῆνας*) in line 11, referring to the deceased’s age or the date of his death. Interestingly, no designation was apparently given for the legion; this would seem to imply that it was well known. It is inconceivable that a legion or any other large body of troops was stationed near Aidepsos. Further speculation on this fragmentary text is probably less than profitable.

²⁷ Richmond Lattimore, *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs* (Illinois Studies 28, Urbana

presumably to settle at Aidepsos. The area around the city was known in antiquity for its mineral resources, which were worked from prehistoric times.²⁸ This inscription is the only evidence, so far as I know, that the mines around Aidepsos were again in production in the later Imperial age. It might be stretching the evidence too far, but it is possible that the elevation of Aidepsos to civic status was connected not only with its position as an elegant resort but also with its renewed importance as a metal-producing and metal-working center. In this regard it is perhaps not fortuitous that Aidepsos produced the first fragments of Diocletian's Price Edict dealing with the regulation of copper and bronze. Presumably these sections were of some interest to the inhabitants of the city.

IV. Aidepsos and the *Synekdemos* of Hierokles

The inscriptions from Aidepsos are an important source on the administrative subdivision of the province and the fate of the cities of the Empire in late antiquity. Crucial to any discussion of these issues is the so-called *Synekdemos* of Hierokles, which was compiled in the early years of the reign of Justinian but based on information from the first half of the fifth century.²⁹ This document is a bare list of cities of the eastern Roman world, arranged province-by-province and in rough geographical order within each province. Because the *Synekdemos* is one of the latest geographical sources preserved from antiquity, it is frequently cited to document the 'latest' period of habitation at little-known ancient sites and to represent the overall pattern of urbanization in late antiquity.

The validity and usefulness of the *Synekdemos*, however, are dependent upon the nature of the document and its accuracy in reflecting

1942) 172–77, 199–202. On this inscription and other wandering Nikomedians, see Louis Robert, "Documents d'Asie Mineure," *BCH* 102 (1978) 423.

²⁸ Steph. Byz. *s.v.*; cf. Sackett *et al.*, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1) 39. O. Davies, *Roman Mines in Europe* (Oxford 1935) 243, however, thinks that the passage in Stephanos was taken from Strabo and that it originally referred to Chalkis. Yet he refers to Papavasiliou (*Praktika* 1912, 141), who thinks that the submersion of the baths in Chalkis in the first century B.C. led to the increased importance of Aidepsos.

²⁹ Ed. A. Burckhardt (Leipzig 1893); better, Ernst Honigmann, *Corpus Bruxellense Historiae Byzantinae, Forma Imperii Byzantini*, fasc.1 (Brussels 1939), with a detailed introduction and brief commentary. Cf. A. H. M. Jones, *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*² (Oxford 1971) 514–21.

the contemporary situation. The text of Hierokles was preserved through the Middle Ages by confusion with episcopal *notitiae*, which it closely resembles in form, but the weight of scholarly opinion is certainly correct in arguing the secular nature of the list, and it is reasonable to suggest that it was ultimately based on official sources. Nevertheless, many problems remain, especially in our understanding of the significance of the inclusion of a name on the list. A. H. M. Jones, for example, argued that the name of the document and the geographical arrangement of the sites show that the present text is an abbreviation of an earlier 'traveler's guide'. Furthermore, the *Synekdemos* consistently includes more entries than are found in other sources: in the province of Achaia, for example, Hierokles records over seventy cities, while the total derived from a compilation of all the near-contemporary episcopal lists is just over twenty. This discrepancy and others like it do not inspire confidence in the validity of Hierokles and have given rise to the suggestion that the *Synekdemos* was based on antiquarian information with little historical value for the period of its compilation.³⁰

In such a situation archaeology may be expected to provide important evidence by confirming or denying contemporary settlement at the sites mentioned in Hierokles. In fact, the archaeological record shows many more inhabited sites than we find even in the *Synekdemos*, although it is possible to confirm late Roman habitation at nearly all of the places listed by this document.³¹ The import of this observation is entirely reasonable: not all inhabited sites, at least as they were defined by Hierokles or his source, are included on the list. Thus, we must return to the problem, with our confidence in the *Synekdemos* perhaps somewhat enhanced by the archaeological evidence, but the issue is still unclear.

³⁰ Antoine Bon, *La Péloponnèse byzantine jusqu'en 1204* (Paris 1951) 21–25; Jones, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.29) 517, "In general, therefore, the Novels do not inspire great confidence in Hierocles' accuracy."

³¹ These conclusions are based on a larger archaeological survey of late Roman Greece which is still underway. Cf. Bon, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.30) 24–25, "c'est l'archéologie qui doit permettre de contrôler la valeur des documents écrits et de dresser peu à peu le tableau exact du pays et de ses transformations"; also D. A. Zakythinos, "La grande brèche dans la tradition historique de l'Hellénisme du septième siècle," in *Χαριστήριο εις 'Αναστάσιον Κ. 'Ορλάνδου* III (Athens 1966) 300–24. See also Emilian Popescu, "Une liste des cités grecques datant du VI^e siècle de notre ère," *Actes du II^e Congrès Internat. des Études du Sud-Est Européen* II (Athens 1972) 323–32.

Fortunately the evidence from Aidepsos considerably clarifies this problem and shows how the list of Hierokles is to be used. The *Synekdemos* mentions four cities in Euboia: Chalkis, Porthmos, Karystos (645, 6–8) and Aidepsos (644, 10). Notable by their absence are Histiaia and Eretria, both of which were certainly inhabited during this period. As we have seen from an examination of the epigraphic evidence, in the late third century or early fourth Aidepsos attained civic status, a fact that is confirmed by the list of Hierokles. What the *Synekdemos* makes clear is that Aidepsos was not simply detached from Histiaia, but that it replaced Histiaia as the city of northern Euboia: both population centers continued to exist but Aidepsos became the ‘capital’ of the region.

A similar substitution seems to have taken place in the center of the island, where, for one reason or another, Porthmos replaced Eretria. The location of ancient Porthmos is a notoriously difficult question, connected with the problems of locating ancient Tamynai, which Strabo (10.1.10) says was *πλησίον τοῦ Πόρθμου*. Porthmos must have been a site of some importance; it may have been the place where the Persians landed in Euboia in 490 B.C., and it took the side of Athens against Macedon in the fourth century and had its walls destroyed as a consequence.³² During the Middle Ages Porthmos had a bishopric, mentioned in several of the *notitiae episcopatum* (Parthey III 427; X 540; XIII 390). In any case, Porthmos must have been located on or near the coast, almost certainly in the area of modern Aliveri.³³

Now the second fragment of Diocletian’s Price Edict that E. J. Doyle discovered on Euboia was from Aliveri, and he reasonably suggested that it had been brought there from Eretria “since it is unlikely that more than one copy of this lengthy document would

³² E. Kirsten, *RE* 22 (1953) 340–44; cf. Wallace, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.7) 142–43; Koder and Hild, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.2) 246. The primary question has been whether to locate Tamynai at Aliveri or farther inland at Avlonari. In either case, Porthmos was clearly toward the sea from either site. In fact excavations at Avlonari (I. Konstantinou and J. Travlos, *Praktika* 1941, 27–41) suggest that Tamynai was located there. In this case, Aliveri and its environs can be identified with Porthmos.

³³ W. M. Leake, *Northern Greece* II (London 1835) 435, placed Porthmos at Porto Buffalo, some 12 km. southeast of Aliveri. For some reason, Koder and Hild, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.7), identify Porthmos with the site at Rizokastron, about 4 km. southeast of Aliveri. Investigations at this spot, however, revealed only a mediaeval fortification: *Deltion* 17 (1961/2) 157–59. This cannot have been the site of the late antique city, whose center must have been either at Aliveri itself or at Kouvaras on the coast close by.

have been set up in a single area.”³⁴ If Aliveri is identified as Porthmos, however, the situation is much simpler. According to the *Synekdemos*, Porthmos had replaced Eretria as the administrative center of the region and the copy of Diocletian’s edict was probably erected there in the first place.³⁵

From this evidence we should conclude that the *Synekdemos* is an accurate reflection of the administrative pattern within a given province with allowances made for cities which may have dropped out of the text during transmission; fortunately the *Descriptio* of George of Kypros and Paris ms. 1555A were obviously both based on the same source(s) used by Hierokles and they can be used as a check. Naturally, the *Synekdemos* reveals nothing about population size or change through time, nor does the absence of a city from the list mean anything other than that it had lost its civic status. The purpose of the *Synekdemos* was to record ‘cities’, but only in the sense that they were understood in the ancient world, as administrative centers within a province.

Thus, the inscriptions from Roman and early Byzantine Aidepsos provide fragmentary but interesting information about an important social center for the provincial Greek aristocracy. That center had close ties with Chalkis and the cities of Boiotia, and ultimately with the ruling power of Rome; as a result Aidepsos flourished during the Imperial period and, even without systematic excavation, a series of public and private inscriptions has come to light, allowing us a revealing glimpse of local conditions. In the reorganization of the Empire in the late third and early fourth century the importance of Aidepsos was recognized and it became the city of that part of the island. This change shows remarkable correspondence with the situation recorded in the *Synekdemos* of Hierokles and helps to show how this document is to be interpreted and used. The inscriptions come to an end in the fifth or sixth century, and there is no reason to associate any of the surviving evidence with a later date. The site was too exposed to invasion by sea and the inhabitants undoubtedly fled to more secure ground, either as a result of the Avar-Slavic

³⁴ *op.cit.* (*supra* n.24) 79.

³⁵ In the so-called Iconoclast Notitia (ms. 1555A): Aidepsos (Ἐδεψοῦ, 733), Chalkis (Ἐπίαια = Ἐ[ὕρι]πία, 750), Porthmos (Πορθίνου, 733), and Karystos (Καρυστίας, 735). N. A. Bees, “Beiträge zur kirchlichen Geographie Griechenlands im Mittelalter und in der neuern Zeit,” *OC* n.s. 4 (1915) 238–78.

incursions of the late sixth/early seventh century, or the growing Arab menace from the middle years of the seventh century. The rest is the history of different communities, centered inland at Lipso and Orei.³⁶

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

May, 1979

³⁶ I express my thanks to the Graduate School of The Ohio State University for financial support allowing me to visit Euboia and examine most of the inscriptions of Aidepsos during July and August of 1978. Thanks are due also to Professors Henry R. Immerwahr and Colin Edmonson of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, and to the Greek Archaeological Service, and particularly to Mrs Eve Touloupa, the Ephor of Classical Antiquities in Chalkis, for permission to carry out this study. Christopher P. Jones, Timothy Barnes, Antony E. Raubitschek, Michael P. Speidel and the anonymous reader for *GRBS* provided much assistance and saved me from many serious errors. Credit is also due to the late Professor E. J. Doyle, whose pioneering work in the inscriptions of Euboia has made much of this study possible.